UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,500	10/16/2001	Patrick P. Naulleau	015780-042	6932

7590 09/02/2004

Fliesler, Dubb, Meyer, & Lovejoy,LLP
Four Embarcadero Center
Fourth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

EXAMINER	
LAVARIAS, ARNEL C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2872	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/981,500	NAULLEAU, PATRICK P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arnel C. Lavarias	2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-9,11-13,15,16 and 18-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-9,11-13,15,16 and 18-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments to Claims 1-2, 7, 11, 18 in the submission dated 6/21/04 are acknowledged and accepted.

2. The cancellation of Claims 6 and 17 in the submission dated 6/21/04 is acknowledged and accepted.

3. The addition of Claims 21-38 in the submission dated 6/21/04 id acknowledged and accepted.

Response to Arguments

4. The Applicant's arguments, see in particular Pages 8-9, filed 6/21/04, with respect to the rejections of Claims 1 and 11 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in Sections 10-14 of the Office Action dated 5/11/04 have been withdrawn.

5. The declaration filed on 6/21/04 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Hamano et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0001109A1) reference.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-16, 18-38 are rejected as follows.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude"

granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1-5, 11-13, 15-16, 21-26, 30-35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6768567.

It is noted that U.S. Patent No. 6768567 is the issued patent for U.S. Patent Application Publication US2003/0227657 A1, which was used in the provisional double patent rejection in Section 8 of the Office Action dated 5/11/04.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent No. 6768567 similarly discloses an illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and a method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source (See Claims 1, 13, 14, 18, 19), wherein the imaging processing system comprises an optical system requiring partially coherent illumination, and where the illuminator comprises a source of coherent or partially coherent radiation, such as a synchrotron, which has an intrinsic coherence that is higher than a desired coherence (See Claims 1, 14); a single holographic diffuser element having a surface that receives incident radiation from the source (See Claim 1, 18); means for translating the surface of

the holographic diffuser linearly in two dimensions along a plane that is parallel to the surface of the holographic element with the proviso that the surface of the holographic diffuser is not rotated (See Claims 1, 14, 17, 18), wherein the rate of the motion is fast relative to integration time of the image processing system (See Claims 1, 14); and a condenser optic that re-images the surface of the holographic element to the entrance plane of the image processing system (See Claim 1). Additionally, U.S. Patent No. 6768567 discloses the coherent or partially coherent radiation being diffracted by the surface of the holographic element to generate diffracted radiation containing diffracted orders of radiation and a zero order of radiation and the illuminator further comprising filtering means to block all but the +1 or the –1 order radiation from reaching the condenser optic (See Claims 1-2); the holographic diffuser being a binary phase, amplitude, or a blazed phase device (See Claims 1, 3-4, 11, 18, 23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6081381), of record, in view of Jannson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5365354), of record, Dammann (H. Dammann, 'Blazed

synthetic phase-only holograms', Optik, vol. 31, no. 1, 1970, pp. 95-104.), and Stanton (U.S. Patent No. 5684566), of record.

Shalapenok et al. discloses an illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and a method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source (See Figure 1), wherein the imaging processing system comprises an optical system requiring partially coherent illumination, and where the illuminator comprises a source of coherent or partially coherent radiation, such as a synchrotron, which has an intrinsic coherence that is higher than a desired coherence (See 10 in Figure 1; col. 4, lines 23-30; col. 9, lines 35-39); a single diffuser element having a surface that receives incident radiation from the source (See 14 in Figure 1); means for translating the surface of the diffuser in at least one dimension along a plane that is parallel to the surface of the diffuser wherein the rate of the motion is fast relative to integration time of the image processing system (See 14 in Figure 1; 114 in Figure 3; col. 7, lines 23-27, 63-67; col. 9, lines 32-34); and a condenser optic that re-images the surface of the holographic element to the entrance plane of the image processing system (See 20 in Figure 1). Shalapenok et al lacks the diffuser being a holographic diffuser that is a blazed phase device and the means for translating the surface of the diffuser doing so linearly in two dimensions with the proviso that the surface of the diffuser is not rotated. However, blazed phase diffuser elements based on volume holographic materials are well known in the art. For example, Jannson et al. teaches a diffuser based on volume phase holographic media (See for example Figure 23; Abstract; col. 16, line 37-col. 20, line 64) which may be used as part of

an optical system to regulate the incident light spatial coherence by rotating or moving the diffuser in the incident light beam (See in particular col. 18, line 62-col. 20, line 64). Further, Dammann teaches that phase holograms may include a blaze that is either of the form of stepped phase functions containing only a few steps or is a sinusoidal approximation of the desired phase relief taking into account only the very first terms of a generalized Fourier series (See Abstract; Figure 1). The combined teachings of Shalapenok et al., Jannson et al., and Dammann lacks the means for translating the surface of the diffuser doing so linearly in two dimensions with the proviso that the surface of the diffuser is not rotated. However, Stanton teaches a photolithography illumination system (See Figure 1) utilizing a diffuser (See 22 in Figure 1), wherein the diffuser is moved linearly in two directions in the plane parallel to the surface of the diffuser (See col. 10, line 58-col. 11, line 53) to adjust the coherence of the incident light onto the diffuser. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have the diffuser in the illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and the method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source of Shalapenok et al., be a holographic diffuser that is a blazed phase device and the means for translating the surface of the diffuser doing so linearly in two dimensions with the proviso that the surface of the diffuser is not rotated, as taught by Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton, for the purpose of 1) providing a larger optical path length of interaction between the incident light and the diffuser, while increasing transmission efficiency and beam shaping capability, and 2) reducing the speckle

cause by the coherence of the light incident on the diffuser, thus producing more uniform illumination conditions.

11. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 1 and 11, except for the holographic diffuser blaze being quantized to between 3 and 8 levels. However, Dammann further teaches that blaze of the holographic diffusers may include stepped phase functions containing a few steps, such as four steps (See Figure 1b). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the holographic diffuser blaze being quantized to between 3 and 8 levels, as further taught by Dammann, in the illuminator device and method of Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton, for the purpose of maximizing transmission efficiency of the hologram.

12. Claims 2-3, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton as applied to Claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Bos (U.S. Patent No. 5825448), of record.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jansson et al., Dammann, and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 1 and 11, except for the coherent or partially coherent radiation being diffracted by the surface of the holographic element to generate diffracted radiation containing diffracted orders of radiation

and a zero order of radiation and the illuminator further comprising filtering means to block all but the +1 or the –1 order radiation from reaching the condenser optic. However, Bos et al. teaches a reflective imaging projection system (See Figure 8) wherein a controllable diffractive optical element, which may be lithographically, holographically or interferometrically generated (See 64 in Figure 8; Abstract), generates diffracted radiation containing diffracted orders of radiation from a source (See 52 in Figure 8), and spatial filters or louvers (See 22 in Figure 6) placed near the diffractive optical element may be used to filter out any particular diffraction order or sets of diffraction orders generated by the diffractive optical element (See col. 1, lines 38-54; col. 3, lines 12-39; col. 17, line 62-col. 18, line 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the coherent or partially coherent radiation be diffracted by the surface of the holographic element to generate diffracted radiation containing diffracted orders of radiation and a zero order of radiation and the illuminator further comprise filtering means to block all but the +1 or the –1 order radiation from reaching the condenser optic, as taught by Bos et al., in the illuminator device and method of Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton, for the purpose of improving the transmission efficiency of the optical system.

13. Claims 8-9, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton as applied to Claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Makabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4845551), of record.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 1 and 11, except for the condenser optic being a single, spherically reflective element. However, Makabe et al. teaches a soft x-ray lithographic system (See Figure 1) wherein the condenser optic (See 2 in Figure 1) is a single, spherically reflective element (See col. 3, lines 8-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the condenser optic be a single, spherically reflective element, such as a spherically concave reflector as taught by Makabe et al., in the illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and a method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source as disclosed by Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton. One would have been motivated to do this to reduce the number of optical elements in the system, thus increasing the overall efficiency and light throughput (this factor being particularly important since source wavelengths of 1-100 nm are being considered and most optical materials are highly absorbing at these wavelengths).

14. Claims 4-5, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton as applied to Claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Kathman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6118559), of record.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 1 and 11, except for the holographic diffuser being a binary phase or amplitude device. However, Kathman et al.

teaches holographic diffractive optical diffusers having binary phase and/or amplitudes (See for example Figures 1 or 2; col. 1, lines 23-62) for applications requiring a large band of design wavelengths and very low zero order efficiency. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the holographic diffuser be a binary phase or amplitude device, as taught by Kathman et al., in the illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and a method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source as disclosed by Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al., Dammann, and Stanton. One would have been motivated to do this to reduce or eliminate the zero order diffraction for the designed source wavelength (i.e. the synchrotron emission wavelength).

15. Claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton.

Shalapenok et al. discloses an illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and a method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source (See Figure 1), wherein the imaging processing system comprises an optical system requiring partially coherent illumination, and where the illuminator comprises a source of coherent or partially coherent radiation, such as a synchrotron, which has an intrinsic coherence that is higher than a desired coherence (See 10 in Figure 1; col. 4, lines 23-30; col. 9, lines 35-39); a single diffuser element having a single surface that receives incident radiation from the source (See 14 in Figure 1); means for translating the surface of the diffuser in at least one dimension along a plane that is parallel to the surface of the

diffuser wherein the rate of the motion is fast relative to integration time of the image processing system (See 14 in Figure 1; 114 in Figure 3; col. 7, lines 23-27, 63-67; col. 9, lines 32-34); and a condenser optic that re-images the surface of the holographic element to the entrance plane of the image processing system (See 20 in Figure 1). Shalapenok et al lacks the diffuser being a holographic diffuser and the means for translating the surface of the diffuser doing so linearly in two dimensions with the proviso that the surface of the diffuser is not rotated. However, optical diffuser elements based on volume holographic materials are well known in the art. For example, Jannson et al. teaches a diffuser based on volume phase holographic media (See for example Figure 23; Abstract; col. 16, line 37-col. 20, line 64) which may be used as part of an optical system to regulate the incident light spatial coherence by rotating or moving the diffuser in the incident light beam (See in particular col. 18, line 62-col. 20, line 64). The combined teachings of Shalapenok et al. and Jannson et al. lacks the means for translating the surface of the diffuser doing so linearly in two dimensions with the proviso that the surface of the diffuser is not rotated. However, Stanton teaches photolithography illumination system (See Figure 1) utilizing a diffuser (See 22 in Figure 1), wherein the diffuser is moved linearly in two directions in the plane parallel to the surface of the diffuser (See col. 10, line 58-col. 11, line 53) to adjust the coherence of the incident light onto the diffuser. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have the diffuser in the illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and the method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source of Shalapenok et al., be a holographic diffuser and the

means for translating the surface of the diffuser doing so linearly in two dimensions with the proviso that the surface of the diffuser is not rotated, as taught by Jannson et al. and Stanton, for the purpose of 1) providing a larger optical path length of interaction between the incident light and the diffuser, while increasing transmission efficiency and beam shaping capability, and 2) reduce the speckle cause by the coherence of the light incident on the diffuser, thus producing more uniform illumination conditions.

16. Claims 22-23, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton as applied to Claims 21 and 30 above, and further in view of Bos.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jansson et al. and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 21 and 30, except for the coherent or partially coherent radiation being diffracted by the surface of the holographic element to generate diffracted radiation containing diffracted orders of radiation and a zero order of radiation and the illuminator further comprising filtering means to block all but the +1 or the –1 order radiation from reaching the condenser optic. However, Bos et al. teaches a reflective imaging projection system (See Figure 8) wherein a controllable diffractive optical element, which may be lithographically, holographically or interferometrically generated (See 64 in Figure 8; Abstract), generates diffracted radiation containing diffracted orders of radiation from a source (See 52 in Figure 8), and spatial filters or louvers (See 22 in Figure 6) placed near the diffractive optical element may be used to filter out any particular diffraction order or sets of diffraction orders generated by the diffractive optical

element (See col. 1, lines 38-54; col. 3, lines 12-39; col. 17, line 62-col. 18, line 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the coherent or partially coherent radiation be diffracted by the surface of the holographic element to generate diffracted radiation containing diffracted orders of radiation and a zero order of radiation and the illuminator further comprise filtering means to block all but the +1 or the –1 order radiation from reaching the condenser optic, as taught by Bos et al., in the illuminator device and method of Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton, for the purpose of improving the transmission efficiency of the optical system.

17. Claims 28-29, 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton as applied to Claims 21 and 30 above, and further in view of Makabe et al.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 21 and 30, except for the condenser optic being a single, spherically reflective element. However, Makabe et al. teaches a soft x-ray lithographic system (See Figure 1) wherein the condenser optic (See 2 in Figure 1) is a single, spherically reflective element (See col. 3, lines 8-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the condenser optic be a single, spherically reflective element, such as a spherically concave reflector as taught by Makabe et al., in the illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and a method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source as

disclosed by Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton. One would have been motivated to do this to reduce the number of optical elements in the system, thus increasing the overall efficiency and light throughput (this factor being particularly important since source wavelengths of 1-100 nm are being considered and most optical materials are highly absorbing at these wavelengths).

18. Claims 24-25, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton as applied to Claims 21 and 30 above, and further in view of Kathman et al.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 21 and 30, except for the holographic diffuser being a binary phase or amplitude device. However, Kathman et al. teaches holographic diffractive optical diffusers having binary phase and/or amplitudes (See for example Figures 1 or 2; col. 1, lines 23-62) for applications requiring a large band of design wavelengths and very low zero order efficiency. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the holographic diffuser be a binary phase or amplitude device, as taught by Kathman et al., in the illuminator device for an optical imaging processing system and a method of modifying the coherence of a beam of radiation from a source as disclosed by Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton. One would have been motivated to do this to reduce or eliminate the zero order diffraction for the designed source wavelength (i.e. the synchrotron emission wavelength).

19. Claims 26-27, 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton as applied to Claims 21 and 30 above, and further in view of Dammann.

Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 21 and 30, except for the holographic diffuser being a blazed phase device quantized to between 3 and 8 levels. However, Dammann teaches that phase holograms may include a blaze that is either of the form of stepped phase functions containing only a few steps or is a sinusoidal approximation of the desired phase relief taking into account only the very first terms of a generalized Fourier series (See Abstract; Figure 1). Dammann further teaches that blaze of the holographic diffusers may include stepped phase functions containing a few steps, such as four steps (See Figure 1b). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the holographic diffuser be a blazed phase device quantized to between 3 and 8 levels, as taught by Dammann, in the illuminator device and method of Shalapenok et al. in view of Jannson et al. and Stanton, for the purpose of providing a larger optical path length of interaction between the incident light and the diffuser, while increasing transmission efficiency and beam shaping capability.

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arnel C. Lavarias whose telephone number is

571-272-2315. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on 571-272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Arnel C. Lavarias
8/26/04

Audrey Chang
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800